

**REMARKS*****Foreign Priority***

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim of foreign priority in the first Office action.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

Applicants thank the Examiner for consideration of the information disclosure statement filed August 1, 2002.

***Summary of the Response***

Upon entry of the response and remarks, claim 15 is amended and claims 15-38 currently remain pending with claims 34-38 having been withdrawn by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Summary of the Official Action***

In the instant Office Action, claims 15-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reidel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,631,073, hereinafter "REIDEL") in view of Ando et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,334,686, hereinafter "ANDO"). Claims 31-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over REIDEL in view of ANDO and Richardson et al., (U.S. Pat. No. 6,200,677, hereinafter "RICHARDSON"). By the present response and remarks, Applicants submit that it is clear that the rejections should be

specifically teach a tearing effort as recited in claim 18, the tear resistance, modulus of elongation, and elongation break as recited in claim 19, the adhesive viscosity as recited in claim 29, and the unrolling effort as recited in claim 30. In this regard, the Office Action includes arguments (i.e., tearing effort, tear resistance, modulus of elongation and break, adhesive viscosity, and unrolling effort that these claim recitations) would have been inherent because REIDEL uses similar materials. However, in view of Applicants arguments with respect to claim 15 above, Applicants respectfully assert that the materials are not similar in view of the fact that Applicant claims a specific fiber immersion depth range and this range is not taught by REIDEL and/or ANDO and therefore the specific properties recited in claims 18, 19, 29, and 30 would not be inherent.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 18, 19, 29, and 30 as being unpatentable over REIDEL in view of ANDO because the physical properties claimed in claims 18, 19, 29, and 30 would not be inherent in REIDEL and ANDO because REIDEL and ANDO do not teach or suggest “the fibers being immersed 10  $\mu$ m to 0.5 mm in the adhesive” as claimed in claim 15.

2. **Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over REIDEL in view of ANDO, as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of RICHARDSON.**

withdrawn, and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application. Specific arguments in response to each of the rejections recited in the Office action are set forth below.

**1. The rejection of claims 15-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over REIDEL in view of ANDO.**

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 15-30 as being unpatentable over REIDEL in view of ANDO in view of the following remarks.

Applicants note that neither REIDEL nor ANDO teaches the specific recitation of claim 15 of, “the fibers being immersed 10  $\mu$ m to 0.5 mm in the adhesive.” The Office Action notes that ANDO teaches an adhesive coating thickness of 50 microns (first Office Action, page 3, last paragraph). However, Applicants note that the coating thickness taught by ANDO is different from the fiber immersion depth as claimed by Applicants. In fact, both REIDEL and ANDO fail to specifically teach any fiber immersion depth. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 15-30 as being unpatentable over REIDEL in view of ANDO because REIDEL and ANDO do not teach or suggest “fibers being immersed 10  $\mu$ m to 0.5 mm in the adhesive” as claimed in independent claim 15.

In addition, Applicants note that REIDEL and/or ANDO fail to teach certain elements of claims 18, 19, 29, and 30. Namely, REIDEL and/or ANDO fail to

***Application is Allowable***

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, and respectfully request the Examiner to indicate allowance of each and every pending claim of the present invention.

***Authorization to Charge Deposit Account***

If for any reason a check including the amount for any necessary fees is not associated with this file, the undersigned authorizes the charging of any necessary fees not explicitly identified, to Deposit Account No. 19 - 0089 in order to maintain pendency of this application.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record, either taken alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipates or renders obvious the Applicants' invention, as recited in each of claims 1 - 4. In addition, the applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Further, any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 31-33 as being unpatentable over REIDEL in view of ANDO and RICHARDSON in view of the following remarks.


Applicants note that the combination of REIDEL and ANDO and RICHARDSON fails to teach “polyethylene and/or polyester based powder applied to the adhesive face of the support” as set forth in claim 31. In this regard, the first Office Action includes arguments that REIDEL, ANDO and RICHARDSON, when combined, teach a “powder based adhesive.” However, the claims do not recite a powder based adhesive. Claim 31 specifically recites “polyethylene and/or polyester based powder applied to the adhesive face of the support.” Applicants note that the powder is an additional component which is applied before the adhesive in order to control the degree of penetration of the adhesive into the support (see page 6, third paragraph of the specification). In contrast, RICHARDSON appears to teach an adhesive which is powder, not a powder applied between the adhesive and the support.


Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 31-33 as being unpatentable over REIDEL in view of ANDO and RICHARDSON because the RICHARDSON does not teach a “polyethylene and/or polyester based powder applied to the adhesive face of the support.”

based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Alain GOUX et al.

  
Neil F. Greenblum  
Reg. No. 28,394

  
Stephen M. Roylance  
Reg. No. 31,296

February 11, 2005  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191